



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,065	10/04/2000	Peter Coad	30013630-0003	8737

23485 7590 09/24/2003

JINAN GLASGOW
P O BOX 28539
RALEIGH, NC 276118539

EXAMINER

CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,065

Applicant(s)

COAD ET AL.

Examiner

Truc T Chuong

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 07/12/03.
2. Claims 1-40 are pending in this application. Claim 1, 6, 13, 17, 22, 29, 33, and 40 are independent claims. In Amendment A, claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 13, 17, 22, 29, 33, and 40 are amended. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A Per Cederqvistson shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Per Cedrqvist et al. (Version Management with CVS for CVS 1.11.3, 1992,1993).

As to claim 1, Per Cederqvist teaches a method in a data processing system for displaying versions of source code, each version reflecting an instance in an edit history (1.1 What is CVS, page 3), the method comprising the steps of.

determining a language of the source code (1.3.1 Getting the source, page 6, .c files (backend.c, driver.c, ...) indicate that these source codes were written in C program);

storing indications of the edits to the source code (1.3.2 Committing your changes, page 6, and 1.3.4 Viewing differences, page 7);

Art Unit: 2174

converting the source code with the indications of the edits from the language into a language-neutral representation (10.3 Conflicts example, page 62-64, shows differences between old and modified versions of the program file, and 5.3 Accessing branches show different version numbers, pages 42-44);

using the language-neutral representation to display the source code in the language with the indications of the edits (5.3 Accessing branches show different version numbers, pages 42-44); and using the language-neutral representation to display a corresponding graphical representation of the source code (Per Cederqvist teaches a graphical user interface for operations because CVS can be run on different platforms including Windows NT/95, 2.2.3 File Permission issues specific to Windows, page 12, and Per Cederqvist clearly shows editing environments are VARY with user operating systems such as: vi editor for UNIX or Notepad editor for Windows NT/95, 1.3.2 Committing your changes, page 6. Notepad and other editors of Windows NT/95 are clearly graphical representations because they are used to view and edit source code with multiple control icons for users to select from.) with the indications of the edits (>>>> and <<<<, pages 62-63, indicate modified part of the code, and 5.3 Accessing branches show different version numbers, pages 42-44) wherein the graphical representation of the source code is not merely a text representation on a user interface (Notepad and other graphical representations are not only displayed the source code in text, but also provide multiple control icons for users to select from.)

As to claim 11, it is individually similar in scope to claim 1 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 2, Per Cederqvist teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the source code and the corresponding graphical representation of the source code are displayed sequentially (\$CVSROOT, page 11).

As to claims 3 and 8, Per Cederqvist inherently teaches the method of claim 1 wherein a rate at which the source code with the indications of the edits is displayed is adjustable because any editing screens of Microsoft Windows can be resized (adjustable) minimized, or maximized.

As to claims 4 and 9, Per Cederqvist teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the source code with the indications of the edits is displayed in reverse order (10.2 Bringing a file up to date, page 61, in first paragraph shows the newest revision of the file is extracted from the repository and put in working directory).

As to claims 5 and 12, Per Cederqvist teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the graphical representation is one of the group consisting of a user case diagram, a sequence diagram (history files for each version control, page 11), a collaboration diagram, a state transition diagram, an activity diagram, a package diagram, a component diagram and a deployment diagram.

As to claim 6, Per Cederqvist teaches a method in a data processing system for displaying versions of source code, each version reflecting an instance in an edit history, the method comprising the steps of:

storing indications of the edits to the source code (page 63); and

displaying the versions of the source code with the indications of the edits (history files, page 11) wherein the source code is represented graphically on a user interface in a

Art Unit: 2174

language-neutral representation (5.3 Accessing branches show different version numbers, pages 42-44).

As to claim 7, Per Cederqvist teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the versions of the source code are displayed sequentially (pages 45-46).

As to claims 10, 13-15, they are similar in scope to claim 1 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 16, Per Cederqvist teaches the method of claim 13, wherein the source code is displayed after the source code with the edit is displayed (10.3 Conflicts example, page 62-64, display a new version 1.7 after the source code has been modified).

As to claims 17-32, these are computer program product claims of method claims 1-16. Note the rejections of claims 1-16 above respectively.

As to claim 33-37, and 39-40, these are system claims of method claims 1-4, 11, 5-6. Note the rejections of claims 1-4, 11, 5-6 above respectively.

As to claim 38, Per Cederqvist teaches the data processing system of claim 37, wherein the memory device further comprises a transient meta model, wherein said transient meta model stores the language neutral representation of the source code (2. The Repository, page 9).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed in pages 7-8 of the Amendment A have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

a. Per Cederqvist does not disclose a graphical representation of the source code.

Art Unit: 2174

- b. Per Cederqvist does not disclose a language-neutral diagrammatic representation of the source code.

Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a) and (b), Per Cederqvist shows a language-neutral representation to display the source code in the language with the indications of the edits (5.3 Accessing branches show different version numbers, pages 42-44); and Per Cederqvist also teaches a graphical user interface for operations because CVS can be run on different platforms including Windows NT/95, 2.2.3 File Permission issues specific to Windows, page 12; furthermore, Per Cederqvist clearly describes editing environments are VARY with user operating systems such as: vi editor for UNIX or Notepad editor for Windows NT/95, 1.3.2 Committing your changes, page 6. Notepad and other editors of Windows NT/95 are clearly graphical representations because they are used to view and edit source code with multiple control icons for users to select from.

Conclusion

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2174

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Truc T. Chuong

09/16/03

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100